

DALO-SSF (700)

8 July 1999

MEMORANDUM FOR SEE DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Single Stock Fund DLA/DAAS Information Exchange  
Meeting, 8-9 June 1999

1. The Single Stock Fund Program Management Office (SSF PMO) hosted subject meeting on the dates indicated. Its purpose was to familiarize DLA and DAAS personnel with the new SSF business process reengineering effort and informally discuss software process flows. Representatives from 18 organizations participated in the review.
2. As the foundation for follow-on discussions, the SSF PMO functional leaders (Logistics, Information Technology, and Finance), the Army Materiel Command National Business Office and the software developers provided an overview of the SSF program. Follow-on discussions highlighted the change process and the difference in the "as is" to the "to be" software system. The specifics of each area discussed are at Enclosure 1.
3. Enclosed for your review are the following:
  - a. After Action Report (encl. 1).
  - b. The list of attendees (encl 2).
  - c. The action items (encl 3).
4. As discussed during the session, we would like to conduct periodic meetings as a formal mechanism to address changes that impact DLA. Our target date for the next session is the end of July or early August 1999. SSF PMO will send a formal request to DLA requesting full participation in the SSF fielding. To support the SSF effort, request addressees continue to assess software processes, with particular emphasis on synchronization

of the entire suite of affected software and be prepared to discuss implementation, issues and concerns.

5. We sincerely appreciate the support and participation that enabled the DLA/DAAS Meeting to be successful.

6. POC is Rick Hodson, DSN 767-0767.

FOR THE DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR LOGISTICS:

6 Encls  
as

SUE BAKER  
Program Manager,  
Single Stock Fund

DISTRIBUTION:

COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF, U.S. ARMY PACIFIC COMMAND, ATTN: APLG-SY  
(MR. LAMPROS)  
COMMANDER,  
**U.S. ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND, ATTN: ATBO-H**  
(MS. PLUMMER/MR. FULLER)  
U.S. ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND, ATTN: NATIONAL BUSINESS OFFICE  
(MS. REYES/MR. MILLER/MR. BLOCK)  
U.S. ARMY FORCES COMMAND, ATTN: AFLG-SM (COL SASSER/  
MR. CAMPBELL/CW5 ALICEA), AFLG-RM (MAJ HOLDERFIELD)  
U.S. ARMY EUROPE, ATTN: AEAGD-MD (MR. CUNNINGHAM)  
**U.S. ARMY COMBINED ARMS SUPPORT COMMAND, ATTN: ATCL-S**  
(MR. KROPP/MS. HUDSON/MS. LAMBERT)  
U.S. ARMY COMMUNICATIONS & ELECTRONICS COMMAND, ATTN: AMSEL-  
LC-LEO-S-SM (MR. CASTRO), AMSEL-LC-LEO-S-SL (MR. ANTHONI)  
U.S. ARMY FIELD ARTILLERY SCHOOL AND FORT SILL, ATTN: DOL  
(MS. CROUCH/MS. HOUSTON)  
21ST THEATER AREA ARMY COMMAND, ATTN: LTC CERVONE  
I CORPS AND FORT LEWIS, ATTN: G4 (MAJ HALL)  
CHIEF, ARMY RESERVE, ATTN: DAAR-LO (MR. ABERCROMBIE)  
DIRECTOR, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD, ATTN: NGB-ARL (CPT MOORE/  
MR HENLEY)  
LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITY, ATTN: AMXLS-RA (MR. PARDI), AMXLS-  
RL (MS. TAYLOR)  
DIRECTOR, DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SYSTEM-INDIANAPOLIS,  
ATTN: MR. HEIDENBLUT  
DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SYSTEM, LAWTON OPLOC, ATTN:  
DFAS-LW-DS (MS. GILBEE/MR.CROOM)  
DIRECTOR, LOGISTICS INTEGRATION AGENCY, ATTN: MR. MELLINGER  
AUDITOR GENERAL, ARMY AUDIT AGENCY, ATTN: MR. AIGEN  
DIRECTOR, ARMY MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS ACTIVITY, ATTN:  
MS. ZMURKEWYCZ  
CALIBRE, ATTN: MR. GOODBODY  
MPRI, ATTN: MR. FLYNN  
GRCI, ATTN: MR. CHERVENKA/MR. CARTWRIGHT/MR. CURD

CF:

**HQDA DALO-ZB (MG CANNON)**

**HQDA DALO-SMZ-A (MS. SHANDS)**

COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF, U.S. ARMY SOUTHERN COMMAND, ATTN: DCSLOG  
COMMANDER, U.S. ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND, ATTN: ADCSLOG  
(MR. SCHEUBLE), NATIONAL BUSINESS OFFICE (MR. SHORTELL)  
COMMANDER, I CORPS AND FORT LEWIS, ATTN: G4 (COL GENTEMAN)  
SSF PMO STAFF

**8-9 Jun 99**  
**Single Stock Fund Defense Logistics Agency/DAAS Synchronization Meeting**  
**After Action Report**

1. Activities on 8 Jun 99 (Day 1)

a. Paul Blackwell (SSF PMO Logistics Functional Lead) opened the session by welcoming attendees and providing an overview of the two-day event. He stated that after several months of deconflicting everyone's schedule we are finally together and ready to discuss how SSF would affect DLA procedures and DAAS software. Paul ensured everyone that SSF was still open to suggestion and alternatives that will help synchronize efforts required supporting both DLA and SSF. Items managed outside the SARSS system would be a central focus of the two-day conference. Paul mentioned that the first day would be used to familiarize attendees to the SSF program; the rest of the meeting would get into the details of implementation and requirements for success. He also mentioned that the meeting objectives were collectively work together to identify tasks, issues, identify Points of Contract (POCs) and develop a common schedule of events.

b. Al Cartwright (GRCI Information Technology Lead Engineer) provided an overview of the SSF Middleware architecture. He explained the concept of Middleware was derived to minimize change to legacy systems. The Middleware will intercept legacy system data and modify it to meet the needs of SSF and its support software programs (Commodity Command Standard System--CCSS, Standard Army Retail Supply System--SARSS, Defense Automatic Addressing System--DAAS, etc.). The design strategy developed by SSF ensures the end user interface is unchanged. Al briefed detailed architecture and it was obvious that instructional overview of the whole SSF process was needed. As an adjunct to the IT familiarization process, Al provided two documents (Appendix A, Legacy Systems and a system integration flow diagram) that would help attendees understand the scope of Middleware. To help attendees understand the relationship of IT systems the following statements were made: SARSS is the major retail system, Army Materiel Command Installation Supply System (AMCISS) is AMC's retail system, and CCSS is the major wholesale system. Wholesale financial system within CCSS and retail AWCF financial system is Standard Army Financial Accounting and Reporting System-Modernization (STARFIARS-MOD). DLA representatives asked what was meant by retail and Al responded the warfighter—installation, user. The following summarizes other questions asked during the Middleware briefing:

(1) Will Middleware check financial transactions? Currently under advisement: recommendation on the table is that Middleware would check financial transactions for duplicates and errors during Milestone 1 and 2.

(2) Why is the SARSS Gateway not in the new Middleware diagram? Error in chart-- Add arrow from Gateway to DAAS.

(3) What is the relationship between Middleware and SARSS-1 for GCSS-A? All SSF business rules will be articulated to GCSS-A Tier 1. Presently, the Supply Support Activity

(SSA) and inventory management modules in GCSS-A will replace SARSS-1 during Tier 1 conversion.

(4) How does Middleware play into Milestone schedule? Middleware server and software will be located at the Demonstration sites (excluding Redstone Arsenal, AL). Middleware and remaining servers will be fielded at each 11 Corps Theater Automated Service Center (CTASC) sites for Milestone 1 and 2.

(5) How will files get from CTASC to Middleware? Middleware server will be co-located with the CTASC hardware and connected to its server.

(6) Will the Middleware server be connected to Integrated Logistics Analysis Program (ILAP)? No, Middleware will provide inputs to ILAP.

(7) Will SSF PMO provide servers? No, GCSS-A will buy their servers early to support SSF requirements.

(8) Will SSF and supporting software systems be Y2K compatible? Yes for CCSS; Yes for SARSS; Yes for Middleware; and Y2K process in work for STARFIAR-MOD--contingency in-place to field update to STARFIARS, if necessary.

(9) When will movement of inventory occur? Intent is to capitalize in-place to minimize movement and costs. Some limited relocation of retention stocks may be required with the restocks associated with Milestone 2.

(10) Test files will be transferred to DLA/DAAS during Demonstration. How will the data (software medium) be transmitted? **Action Item DLA-02:** SSF PMO will brief details of medium transfer of test data from the Demonstration activities to DLA/DAAS. **Suspense:** Next DLA/DAAS Meeting with SSF PMO. **POC:** Don Hartzell (SSF IT Functional Lead).

c. Lew Johnson (SSF PMO Financial Functional Lead) briefed financial system changes as they related to SSF. The key point is the elimination of a multiple points of sale (POS) and two-tiered credit transactions. SSF will introduce the single POS and single credit system, Army-wide. **Single POS** is defined as the point at which a consumer-funded requisition is satisfied by a nationally controlled AWCF-SMA account. This means that consumer-funded requisitions will be obligated upon submission from the CTASC. Billing will occur when the AWCF-SMA account issues the item. This point of sale could be in one of two places in the AWCF-SMA. If the item is stocked locally, the supporting AWCF-SMA SARSS-1 account will issue it to the O&M customer. If the item is not stocked locally, then the wholesale source of supply will issue the item. For consumer-funded organizations supported by an AWCF-SMA SARSS-1 account (such as TRADOC units), the AWCF-SMA account would be required to place its own AWCF-SMA funding on the requisition, and pass to NAMI sources of supply. Under these procedures, O&M funded documents not filled by the AWCF-SMA SARSS-1 account would pass forward to Integrated Materiel Management Centers (IMMCs) for Army-managed items or to other sources of supply for non-Army managed items. Billing would occur directly between the source of supply and the O&M customer. **Single credit process--DA**

ODCSLOG approved a new credit policy that establishes a uniform credit and pricing mechanism from the SSF to the customer. The entire Army will adopt a new single credit policy effective 1 Oct 00 (FY01) by granting credit on an NSN-by-NSN, rather than the current procedures, which is accomplished by Materiel Category (MATCAT). Credit will use the same media for distribution to the field, (Army Master Data File (AMDF) and Federal Logistics Information System (FEDLOG)) that customers use now to access prices. Credit values will be provided for serviceable and unserviceable materiel, for both AMI and NAMI materiel. This will guarantee that customers have stable, predictable credit for one year. As a result, execution management will be predictable, customer planning will be more reliable, and budgeting will be standardized for credit. The following summarizes other questions asked during the financial briefing:

(1) How does the funding get moved to the customer, AMI then NAMI, inter-depot transfer, replenishment? Will Middleware pass consumer's fund codes? Yes, but it gets very complicated for NAMI items on inter-depot transfers. IMMC will put AWCF fund code on those requisitions. Also, Middleware will verify fund codes.

(2) Will Credit be based on national asset posture? Yes, and credit will be locked in for the entire year. Credit for NAMI items will be projected using national asset posture. Historically, credit for serviceable NAMI items has been 3 percent (100 percent if asset support national demand), so current plans will use this same, basic procedure. (i.e., the credit given for return of materiel to DLA has historically been approximated at three percent of the total dollar of the items returned)

(3) How would you complete credit reversal under SSF? Credit reversal will be minimized under SSF. Credit reversal should be by exception and not a rule. More discussion on this subject will be discussed during follow-on meetings with DLA/DAAS (**Action Item DLA-03**).

c. John Otis (Representative from the AMC National <sup>Program</sup> Business Office-NBO) briefed on the status of the "emerging" National Maintenance Management (NMM) process. He mentioned that NBO will become the sustainment manager for SSF after full implementation. He added that process flow development is in work and should clearly define roles and responsibilities of the NMM. The NBO will establish standard business practices and implement policy guidance to support their efforts. Working together is definitely a key for SSF to move forward. NBO will partner with installations, DLA and other organizations to create a system that will seamlessly project and manage SSF assets. The NBO will be responsible for the management of installation's Authorized Stock Lists (ASL), managing component repair programs and integrated workloading, and implementing necessary funding to support "Big Army" requirements. The Center of Excellence process was briefed and a detailed process flow was provided to all attendees. Also, NBO recognizes that MACOMs have been very effective at meeting their needs and saving money through the use of local repair programs, but combined they may sub-optimize each other and the "Big Army." NBO is anticipating storage capacity to be a significant problem that requires special attention during conversion to SSF and maintenance thereafter. Discussion ended with John mentioning that updates to the NMM

procedures will be provided during follow-on meetings with DLA/DAAS (**Action Item DLA-04**).

d. Paul Blackwell briefed Integrated Requirements Determination (IRD) stating at the outset, "that Retail and Wholesale systems are not currently linked and do not provide asset visibility--under SSF that would change." Under SSF, installation stocks would be part of a nationally managed inventory. SARSS would continue to be used as a vehicle for management of stocks located at installation level. Non-Army managed stock within the SSF will be redistributed by exception only. SARSS will also continue calculating Requisitioning Objectives (ROs) and retention levels (RLs) for the AWCF-SMA SARSS-1 sites. Middleware will pass that information to CCSS. SSF IRD will be based on consolidated, national ROs and assets.

e. Paul Blackwell presented SSF Metrics overview. He provided history of all tasks associated with the development of SSF metrics and provided all attendees with the latest copy of the Metrics Baseline spreadsheet. Paul explained the spreadsheet by breaking out the specific categories of metrics and the definition of short-term, mid-term and long-term metrics. Short-term metrics cater to the Demonstration and will be used to evaluate and support Demonstration exit criteria. Mid-term (transitional) metrics will be collected at the Demonstration sites, but will be monitored through April 2001 to provide enough data to for thorough assessment. Long-term (enduring) metrics will be recommended as institutional to sustainment managers. Presently there are 37 total metrics for SSF. The data collection process is in work and will start collection process early summer of 1999. More details will be briefed at follow-on meetings with DLA/DAAS.

f. Paul Blackwell led open discussion to conclude SSF overview briefings. Open discussions led to several issues; each listed separately below.

(1) How will Obligation Authority (OA) be determined? Still being worked. Update at next DLA/DAAS meeting (**Action Item DLA-06**).

(2) DLA clarified that their credit is computed by an item-by-item basis and set on the net asset position when materiel is received. They took exception to the allegation of three-percent credit. Their system provides a credit equal to the acquisition price when the item is in short supply. }

(3) How will Army check with DLA on excess materiel to see if they have a tri-~~service~~ service need? DLA (Mary Horvath) stated that excess materiel should be visible to DLA for posturing by their national manager prior to Army disposition. Paul Blackwell stated that the Army would turn in NAMI excess into the DWCF activity based on an FTE. He stated this should be the first step in the long-term plan for DLA to manage the items down to the consumer level. This requires Supply policy review to align with DoD policy making the excess item available to DLA prior to Army disposition. Further details will be discussed at next DLA/DAAS meeting to include DLA processes of predicting demand and how they would position forward stock and how Strat is accomplished within DLA. Brief details at next meeting **Action Item DLA-07**).

(4) Will DLA consider going to ownership at the point of consumption?

Representatives from DLA, Captain Milligan, USN and Mary Horvath stated DLA would consider such a policy. DLA ownership experience in Japan and Pearl Harbor, for the Navy, shows considerable savings. Studies on pre-positioning retail stock and affects on operating and carrying costs are underway in the Navy. Initial reports show the system is contributing to significant savings, providing total asset visibility and having improved capability to feed inter-service and theater demands and supports OCONUS depot transition program. Now, the largest Navy Field Installation Support Center (FISC) is running out of CONUS reaching well into the Gulf Theater. If this process were to be adopted by the Army, it would require associate changes in business rules. DLA also convinced the Navy of savings associated with DLA management of the distribution functions at these locations. DLA will present more information and possible course of action at the follow-on meetings with SSF (**Action Item DLA-08**).

(5) Provide a demand list of items to SSF PMO that might be used nationally. DLA wants to make sure this list would not be all inclusive, posture changes so quickly. Paul Blackwell thought that the Army may want to revisit its credit policy for NAMI if such a list could be obtained (**Action Item DLA-09**).

f. Maritza Neuman presented the latest information on the "Assessment of Non-Army Managed Items in the SSF." She stated approval from Ms. McCoy, DA DCSLOG, and the Executive Steering committee was recently received to proceed with the plan to incorporate only SARSS supported NAMI items into SSF (non-SARSS supported NAMI items will be excluded). Only one organization, MEDCOM, has not formally agreed to this plan, but a meeting with MEDCOM is planned for week of 17 Jun 99 to discuss specifics and determine how NAMI will be managed in their commnad. Maritza requested DLA/DAAS representation at the subject meeting and stated specific would be provided via e-mail. Maritza continued to discuss driving factors behind the decision. She mentioned that the most significant factor in the decision process was the numerous IT changes required to support "total NAMI" solution in SSF. To date there are 21 ECPs to support NAMI software changes—working with John Milliken (AMC DLA Liaison) to formalize draft plan. Other assessment goals included: scope of NAMI inclusions required for "efficient" SSF, determining if commodity specific logistics systems should remain in the SSF, and ensure changes do not adversely impact customers. To implement the program, one activity will be selected to coordinate NAMI items located in AWCF-SMA and AMCISS sites. To date, that support will come from Rock Island. DLA reiterated several times that they need to ensure the proper authority from their organization is provided prior to making final decisions on issues that affect DLA. LtCOL Rosales, DLA/DLSC-B stated the need to include DLA on message traffic and be given advanced notice of SSF meetings that require DLA support. She requested an DA DCSLOG message requesting DLSC commander (DLA ) provide full support to SSF effort. The message should include a summary of action required to support SSF fielding (**Action Item DLA-01**). The following summarizes other questions asked during the NAMI briefing:

(1) Mary Horvath, DLA asked for clarification on the inventory holding criteria for adding or retaining items on the installation's Authorized Stockage List (ASL). If ASL demands exceed three recurring hits in a 180-day time period, an item can be added. If demand and issues exceed 6 hits in a 180-day period it is maintained as recurring stock. Aircraft (PRISM) stock is



managed in a similar process, but with much stricter standards related to airworthiness issues. The Aviation Intensive Management Item Program restricts items in short supply based on negotiation at Worldwide Aviation Logistics Conferences each year.

(2) Martiza requested consideration from DLA to move up NAMI fielding concept as soon as possible, especially capitalization of bulk fuels prior to Demonstration starting 1 Apr 99. DLA took this action into consideration and will reply as soon as possible with their initial thoughts.

(3) Converting general ledger to a national level was discussed. Initial thoughts were to attrit stock and start buying replenishment stock directly from DLA. Captain Milligan, USN, DLSC-B, provided several options, however, he cautioned the forum that they were only initial thoughts and only when formally approved should we move forward to implementation. His statement was based on past relationships with services that used DLA informal discussions as a source of decision prior to formal authorization. With SSF and all the necessary actions required to support its fielding, we can't afford to do things in this fashion. He proceeded by outlining the options. Option 1, Army would be the responsibility to dispose of excess. He added this option is not economically sound and lacks national management involvement. Option 2, DLA would consider buying back excess if they had a national demand. Option 3, DLA would review Army inventory and would buy certain items in advance of attritting. Option 4, would transfer field level reparable back to the Army via logistics reassignment. All options will be carefully weighed by DLA and will include an assessment of "cash implications."

(4) Will there be a computation for a national RO? Yes, for NAMI. Initially NMM will turn to MACOMs to establish EOQ or set RO levels. However, the national RO will only be a roll-up of the installation ROs computed by SARSS. The only authorized levels will be order ship times, operating levels and safety levels. No procurement lead-times and reorder cycles will be included.

g. Sue Baker, SSF PMO attended the afternoon session. She told everyone how important the integration process is to SSF and how much she appreciated the good turnout. She continued to say, "there is a lot of work to be accomplished, but processes, tasks and schedules are aligning. A disconnect/Reconnect test was being conducted simultaneously with the DLA/DAAS meeting and the initial indications are successful. It's great that the group is digging down into the detail process flow and working at that level. Army has been working on SSF for a long time and now the resources have been adjusted in the POM, so there is no turning back. SSF PMO needs up-front work to eliminate potential showstoppers. The immediate forthcoming significant event is the Roadshow to FORSCOM. She stated the concern by the field and the Chief of Staff of the Army that we really have a potential to mess things up. The field must be shown that we can do it right. SSF is the future. She thanked DLA and DAAS for their support and ensured them that sufficient information will be provided over the next few months to assist in a synchronized software solution.

h. Paul Blackwell presented SSF assumptions that affected DLA/DAAS and he entertained open discussion. Two new assumptions were added to the original list (see Tab X). The first new item was the need to add statement on Supply Brownouts and Blackouts to

facilitate reduction of general ledgers to zero dollars prior to conversion to SSF. This activity would affect automated reporting of excess to DLA, processing of receipts and issues and volume of requisitions at the DLA ICPs. It will also effect edit criteria and routing of transactions by DAAS. The second new item was a requirement to waive 7 day waiting period for the last 15 days prior to conversion and how it may effect GSA, DLA and other Services (see GLAC 1580.02, for RFIARS it's GLAC 1521.2). According to the attendees, the assumptions, with the additions listed above, were acceptable as written. DLA requested continued discussions of assumption; it will remain a standing item on the DLA/DAAS/SSF agenda **(Action Item DLA-10)**.

## 2. Activities on 9 Jun 99 (Day 2)

a. Paul Blackwell opened the second day asking the attendees if the information provided was useful and in enough detail provide the scope of SSF and its affect on DLA and DAAS. All attendees agreed that the information presented was detailed and that the only issue is the new language and concepts brought to the table. Paul added that the learning curve is definitely ramping up and at the end of today's session we will work out a schedule that will continue to bring us together so we can start to address and formalize all efforts necessary for the successful fielding of SSF. Paul mentioned that the remaining portion of the briefings would target actual IT processes required to support SSF and that the discussion would be tailored to the DLA/DAAS audience.

b. Sandra Price, Lead AMC Integration Support Office (LIASO) briefed the detailed process flows which centered around SARSS-1, AWCf CTASC, Gateway, DAAS CCSS, STARFIARS-MOD, STANFINS, SSF Middleware and functionality of AMI and NAMI transactions. AMI transactions were briefed first and discussion included materiel releases from DOLs, replenishment requisitions, direct requisitions (total fill by CCSS) and the release, and turn-in processes. The briefing was detailed to assist DLA/DAAS scope their effort with SSF. After Sandra completed her slide presentation the process flows would be updated and passed to SSF PMO to be placed on their web site ([www.army.mil/ssf/index.html](http://www.army.mil/ssf/index.html)). The following are discussion items or notes from the AMI briefing:

(1) Direct requisitions (total fill by CCSS): AOs will be forwarded from CTASC to CCSS via Middleware. Middleware will pass valid MILBILS fund codes to DAAS and CCSS.

(2) Should DAAS perform a fund code edit on Post-Post AOs? Sandra Price, LAISO said CCSS perform an edit; DAAS representatives said they would probably do the same.

(3) AMI (ARI Items) Turn-in (Serviceable) Flow: Local RMs will have to keep EOR tables updated, same procedures currently in place today. FD2s must have fund codes for STANFINS. Return vice codes with exception will automatically override credit and be ignored by DAAS software.

(4) AMI (ARI Items) Turn-in (Unserviceable) Flow: Condition code will be the source information to determine if the item is serviceable or not.

(5) AMI Non-ARI Turn-in: SARSS parameter table will be modified if necessary to send unserviceable item to local DOL repair shop. If COE repair cannot be accomplished a determination will be made to the disposition of the item. FTE will be sent to Middleware and Middleware will tag column 80 and pass to CCSS for disposition. MGJ is a new routing code, which means dispose of asset and drop from account to A5 transaction, then to A0 ship to CCSS. Note: discussion began with A0s, but was expanded to include (tentatively) all transactions.

(6) Fundamental to SSF implementation into DAAS system: DAAS communication will require use 79/80 hard column. DLA may want to put function in Middleware to route to CCSS RNE. LOGSA input is not to use "R" as the code in 79/80, but suggested the use of "S" for SSF, Bill Strickler, DLA, is taking under advisement (**Action Item DLA-11**). Bill wants to stay away from table change in DAAS.

(7) DAAS prepares an LMARS report that includes data such as requisitioning response time, processing delays, etc that would be skewed by Post-Post transactions. There was a tentative agreement to exclude the following from the LMARS report: replenishment requisitions with fund code "MGK", Post-Post A0s with fund codes "GK" and "GM", and Post-Post A2s with fund codes "GK". DAAS asked how these procedures are implemented after Milestone 1 and 2; will they be part of GCSS-A. The answer is Yes.

(8) When does obligation occur in STARFIARS-MOD? When CTASC passes to STARFIARS-MOD.

(9) Since SARSS cannot accept A5s, should they be routed from CCSS, by passing DAAS, through Middleware for conversion to A4 or could a flag be placed in CC 80 to indicate SSF SARSS RIC, on the A5? DAAS indicated yes, but wanted to do complete assessment of situation before committing to a position. Also, under consideration is the code for CC 80; initial thoughts would be an "S" for SSF.

(10) If Middleware is converting A5s to A4s, why not just have CCSS produce A4s? We need A5s because it shows condition codes and purpose codes, as Middleware records need to match SARSS records for reconciliation purposes. SARSS software change request in review process to make this happen.

(11) Are SARSS sites going to perform inventories when warehouse denials occur? Yes, SARSS logic initiates inventory for each denial.

c. Sandra Price presented information on SSF NAMI items by going through the subjects presented for AMI items. The discussion led to many actions and specific tailoring of DAAS software and tables to interpret transaction messages passed from Middleware and/or CCSS. All A5s out of CCSS will need to be flag in CC 80 as discussed above in AMI process flow.

(1) What RIC is on the A5 coming out of the redesignated user activity? The "From" RIC.

(2) If the RUA has a distinct RIC, why do we need a “S” flag in CC 80? Required to prevent routing to SOS. Action required to put RUA RIC on AROs for NAMI items. Brief new RUA process at next meeting (**Action Item DLA-12**).

(3) Could we put RUA RICs on all NAMI transactions? Yes. Do we want to make this a decision for Middleware? Yes, per SSF Business Rules, Requirement Implementation Procedure 4.6.

(4) Have RUA codes been requested? Yes, but we will have to ask AMC who they submitted request to. POC for this action is Sandra Price, she will ensure John Mays (coordinator for AMC) staffed her request.

(5) What funding code is going from the RUA to Non-Army SOS (i.e., what appropriation will be charge)? Significant issue that needs to be addressed. Will include detailed discussion at next DLA/DAAS/SSF meeting.

(6) Will RUA RICs be included in F09 file? Yes, every action that affects/changes the supply system will also affect the financial system.

(7) Are there any other SARSS customers other than DOL? Yes, OMA retention stocks will be picked up during MS1 and 2 consolidation.

(8) Action on turn-ins: SSF PMO must verify condition codes to be used for serviceable and unserviceable definition with LSSC and pass to DLA.

(10) Can I get A5s direct from Middleware? Bill says he took a note....how can DAAS do that, must be a SARSS-1 RIC (this affects only 11 CTASC, more than 80 RICS MS1/2). Jay....GCSS-A will do this with a table. Can CCSS do it? Sandra this may be the answer to transactions going out with a flag in CC 80.

(11) AMI transaction cannot be changed by SARSS, CCSS. For NAMI, will DAAS conversion be necessary?

(12) Sandra 1171 MRO at of ARI needs a flag all A-5s—will be transaction source of supply routed to user activities

(13) RUA RIC in A5 return should be the same AR0 coming back maybe (NAMI Replenishment Req)....still look in 80 for this one...do normal if possible. MW A5 to DAAS if it has RIC pass to RUA.

ACALA is run on separate domain so new RIC will work

Two option:

1<sup>st</sup>—AR0, RUA RIC for NAMI, mw will do...Jay

Or (not going to happen)

2d—GCSS-A TIER 1, 2, DLA part---for solution will be passed

However we do this we need to be consistent with implementation for DAAS, AMDF tag by Middleware for A6 will be passed....is this OKAY. Still need to route differently for A0s need to go to RUAs, RUA transactions mw will tag RIC for NAMI, DAAS will pass to CCSS. GRCI will add this function to Middleware.

(14) DLA RM -- DLA financial POM will track to appropriate account via TAE, a precedent we can't afford, budget decrement

(15) Should be parking lot issue to Financial DLA ISSUE REFERRALS (DLA term for Partial) Partial is done via A3 to non-Army source of supply...no finance problem DLA will issue items available. YDO will be used to identify the split in req. AEBMS will work. To be system what will cause the transaction, what will call the disbursement

(16) How will D6S inter-bill be passed? Will that cause a disbursement action?

(17) There may be credit exceptions for serviceable turn-ins to 3% Business Rules. During next meeting and after more integration work is complete; SSF PMO will discuss with DLA/DAAS about possible additions of Implementing procedures to the Business Rules.

(18) Working-level meeting to discuss transaction processes needed between GRCI, DAAS, and LIASO (**Action Item DLA-13**).

d. Chuck Woodward led a discussion on "Signal and Fund Codes." DLA and DAAS recommended we work on the details with the edit process to ensure the links are provided between Middleware and DAAS software. As the group reviewed the fund codes, it was obvious that further discussion was needed. DLA/DAAS suggested that they would take the information Chuck briefed and review it in detail during the next three weeks. Paul stated that since this was the first meeting with DLA/DAAS to talk about SSF integration he knew that it would take a significant effort to bring requirements in line. There are many questions that require answers. Does DAAS edit fund codes of Army requisitions? Is the training problem with disposition codes, currently being experienced, going to continue under SSF? Can FY billing year information be built into Type Action Code 3 (TAC 3) to include "bill to addresses" in order to assist in accounting of OMA funds? Bill Strickler took an action to review the whole SSF process within a working-level forum and present requirement at next meeting at the end of July 99.

e. Paul Blackwell presented a briefing on "DOD Lateral Distribution Impacts." He stated that SSF will capitalize all retail stock into national inventory starting Oct 00. TAV will query AMC. Credits will be returned to AMC's ICP.

f. Don Hartzell, SSF PMO IT Functional Lead provided an overview of daily and annual supply inventory reconciliation as mandated by AMCL-8A. Daily (end-of-day) reconciliation will be conducted at each SARSS site with each NICP. Middleware will compare NSN, storage RIC, CC project code, and OP code with last reconciliation. Middleware will convert the difference to DZHs and forward to CCSS SOS. CCSS compares balances and makes adjustments to NSNMDR as necessary. If there is a mismatch between actual balance affecting transaction

the item coding will be changed to DZK and placed on hold for 5 days to see if an eventual match will occur. If it isn't reconciled the item gets routed to the IMMC IM for disposition. Annual reconciliation takes the same path except the process starts with SARSS-1 doing an ABF upload and incremental audits will be conducted between SARSS-1 sites and their CTASC. The details of how this ABF process will work are still being staffed. At follow-on meetings SSF will provide updates (**Action Item DLA-14**). NAMI will be reconciled at the RUA.

g. Paul Blackwell closed the meeting outlining requirements to formulate roles and responsibilities, to identify POCs and establish a strawman schedule of events for the upcoming quarter. Roles and responsibilities will be discussed in detail at next DLA/DAAS/SSF meeting. The session ended with a discussion on schedule of events.

(a) Meet with DLA to discuss possible DLA ownership of stocks

(b) DLA will be invited to all future SSF meetings

(c) Working level meeting to review details of Middleware to ensure it provides all the necessary information, in the proper format, to DAAS. Meeting tentatively scheduled for end of July 99.

(d) May need a business rule meeting, especially if DLA gains total ownership of NAMI

(e) Jan 00 is when all system software changes will start (if not already finished) end-to-end verification testing.

(f) Entertain adding DLA commander to the Roadshow calendar

At the close of the meeting, the SSF web site location ([www.army.mil/ssf/index.html](http://www.army.mil/ssf/index.html)) was provided to the attendees as a source for detailed information that can be used to familiarize personnel with SSF history, schedules, and information including acronyms and process flows.

## DLA/DAAS Meeting 8-9 JUN 99

Name	Organization	Phone	E-mail Address
Barrow, Tom	HQDA	703-697-3122	barrota@hqda.army.mil
Blackwell, Paul	SSF PMO	703-617-3671	pblackwel@hqamc.army.mil
Boggio, Tina	DLA/DLSC-B	703-767-3600	tina_boggio@hd.dla.mil
Briggs, Jay	GRCI	703-506-5583	jbriggs@grci.com
Cartwright, Al	GRCI	703-506-5785	acartwright@grci.com
Clark, Dorothy	DMC	1-800-471-8818	dclark@dmcco.com
Clark, Terry (Major)	PM-SSF	703-617-0747	tclark@hqamc.army.mil
Cook, Bill	DFAS-IN	317-510-6153	bill.cook@dfas.mil
Cremisio, R.D. (LTC)	AMCSA-AR	703-617-2115	dcremisio@hqamc.army.mil
Curd, John	GRCI	703-506-5714	jcurd@grci.com
Fox, Susan	DLA/FOBR	703-767-7296	susan_fox@hq.dla.mil
Franks, John	GRCI	804-734-7678	jfranks@calibresys.com
Fulgham, Quintin (Major)	USARC	404-464-8552	fulghamqu@USARC-emh2.army.mil
Hartzell, Don	PMO SSF	703-617-0452	dhartzell@hqamc.army.mil
Hauk, Jeanette	DFAS-IN	317-510-5436	jeanette.hauk@dfas.mil
Heidenblut, Jerry	DFAS-IN	317-510-3045	jerold.heidenblut@dfas.mil
Hodson, Rick	SSF PMO	703-617-0767	rhodson@hqamc.army.mil
Horvath, Mary	DLSC-LS	703-767-1524	mary_horvath@hq.dla.mil
Jacobson, Dennis	DFAS-IN	317-510-3043	dennis.jacobson@dfas.mil
Lavenuta, Ernest	Calibre Sys	703-697-3122	lavene@hqda.army.mil
Leder, Ruth	LOGSA	256-955-9653	rleder@logsa.army.mil
Liakos, Mitch	SSF PMO	703-617-8535	mliakos@hqamc.army.mil
Michael, Stephanie (Major)	OCAR-Comptroller	703-601-0899	michaels@ocar.army.pentagon.mil
Milligan, Bob (Captain, SC, USN)	DLSC-BO	703-767-3600	robert_milligan@hq.dla.mil
Milliken, John	HQ AMC	703-617-8278	jmilliken@hqamc.army.mil

DLA-01	Letter from SSF PM Requesting Formal DLA Assistance	SSF PMO	Closed-6 Aug 99
DLA-02	Brief details of medium transfer of test data from End-to-End test and Demonstration sites	GRCI	Next DLA/DAAS Mtg
DLA-03	Discuss credit reversal policy	SSF PMO	Next DLA/DAAS Mtg
DLA-04	NMM procedures update	NPO	Next DLA/DAAS Mtg
DLA-05	Update on metrics collection	SSF PMO	Next DLA/DAAS Mtg
DLA-06	How will Obligation Authority be determined?		Next DLA/DAAS Mtg
DLA-07	How will Army check to see if there is a Tri-service need of Army excess materials? Must go through DLA prior to disposal per DOD policy.	SSEPMO NAMI CBU	Next DLA/DAAS Mtg
DLA-08	Brief DLA future concept to capitalization NAMI to lowest level (Installations). How does Army fit into plan?	DLA	Next DLA/DAAS Mtg
DLA-09	Provide a demand list of NAMI items to DLA	GRCI (Jay Briggs)	Next DLA/DAAS Mtg
DLA-10	DLA review NAMI assumptions. SSF PMO continue to brief at mtgs	SSF PMO	15 Oct 99
DLA-11	How will SSF items be identified to DAAS. Column 79 or 80 or ?	B. Strickler Jay Briggs	Next DLA/DAAS Mtg
DLA-12	Brief new NAMI CBU process and funding code requirements	NAMI CBU	Next DLA/DAAS Mtg
DLA-13	Convene working-level meeting to discuss SSF requirements and DAAS changes. At meeting also address routing identifiers and options.	B. Strickler Jay Briggs	Scheduled for late Jul/Aug. Details to be briefed at Next DLA/DAAS Mtg
DLA-14	Brief final daily and annual reconciliation process	SSF PMO	Next DLA/DAAS Mtg



Name	Organization	Phone	E-mail Address
Moore, Tim	GRCI	703-506-5154	tmoore@grci.com
Mueller, Claudia	HQDA, ASA FM&C	703-697-3122	muellercm@hqda.army.mil
Otis, John	AMCLG-NBO	703-617-5614	jotis@hqamc.army.mil
Pemberton, Dave (Major)	OCAR	703-601-3448	pemberto@ocar.army.pentagon.mil
Piper, Bill	GRCI	703-506-5419	wpiper@grci.com
Powers, Terry	Calibre Sys	703-845-1000	tpowers@calibresys.com
Price, Sandra	AMCOM/LAISO	256-955-9645	pricesn@redstone.army.mil
Richardson, Ruth Ann	AAA-SSF	703-617-0399	rrichardson@hqamc.army.mil
Rosales, Lana (Lt Col, USAF)	DLA/DLSC-B	703-767-3548	lana_rosales@hq.dla.mil
Sangl, Rudy	SSF PMO	703-617-0458	rsangl@hqamc.army.mil
Sankey, Gus	DLSC-C	703-767-1518	gus.sankey@hq.dla.mil
Strickler, Bill	DAASC	936-656-3745	wstrickler@daas.dla.mil
Warfel, Rich	LOGSA	256-955-9585	rwarfel@logsa.army.mil
Woodward, Chuck	GRCI, SSF PMO	703-617-0722	cwoodward@hqamc.army.mil
<b>SSF Web Site: <a href="http://www2.army.mil/SSF/index.html">www2.army.mil/SSF/index.html</a></b>			